

Gina Mouser

From: Vern Crawford [vacrawford@msn.com]
Sent: Tuesday, July 07, 2009 8:41 AM
To: Karen Sides
Subject: Fw: 10-12 month contracts
Attachments: 1676ER.pdf

----- Original Message -----

From: Vern Crawford
To: Jeffrey Hernandez
Cc: Joe Moore ; Ann Killets ; Gerald Williams ; Darron Davis
Sent: Friday, May 22, 2009 2:00 PM
Subject: 10-12 month contracts

Resending with bill attached...sorry,

vc

----- Original Message -----

From: Vern Crawford
To: Jeffrey Hernandez
Cc: Joe Moore ; Ann Killets ; Gerald Williams ; Darron Davis
Sent: Friday, May 22, 2009 1:58 PM
Subject: 10-12 month contracts

In response to your query, while I am awaiting word from FLDOE legislative staff, I spoke with both Joy Frank, FADSS general counsel and chief lobbyist, and Martin Miller who lobbies for Duval schools, but spent decades as personnel and negotiations head and is a respected source, on how districts should handle section 27 (pp.45-47 of SB1676er, attached) concerning 10 month contracts.

Both reaffirmed my understanding that we had from legislative staff: there simply needs to be an auditable trail by way of job description, specific personnel appointments (PBSD has both) or detailed policy outlining which jobs are 10 month and which are more. Since most personnel for FY10 have been or will have been approved before June 30th (as required by separate law--three weeks after legislative adjournment or issuance of school grades), districts DO NOT need to go back retroactively for approvals. Also, these approvals constitute approved contracts, same as the CTA agreement, which carry the weight of policy.

We do not need to redo all personnel appointments made so far for next year as both the job description and line items in the personnel agendas list the number of duty days.

It was suggested to me, "in an abundance of caution", that since the new language speaks to months and our job descriptions/appointments speak to duty days, we may want to bring an item before the Board that simply says something to the effect that:

"in making certain the the district is in compliance with s.1011.60(3)(d) and (f), as amended by SB1676 (2009 regular session), the contract period of 10 months means anyone employed up to a 206-duty day contract; that contracts exceeding 10 months, but not 12 months may have duty day periods of 216, 226, 236 or as otherwise approved by the Board as being more than 206-days. The instructional 196-duty day contract is

considered a 9-month contract in accordance with the Collective Bargaining Agreement between the School Board and the PBC Classroom Teachers Association..."

I understand school board attorneys, hopefully including ours, will be attending next week's FSBA meeting where Joy, Martin and others will say the same thing they told me today. I suggest you talk with Darron and Gerald Williams for concurrence to the above "safety precaution" and any other suggestions they may have.

I recognize the end of next week is tight up against the June 3rd Board meeting, but you can always do a Board place holder and ask Dr. J to allow for a modified Board agenda item if there is any necessary change based on what arises from the FSBA meeting.

Hope this helps.

Vern